REMARKS

Claims 2, 5-9, 11, 14-18, 20 and 21 are pending in this application. Claims 6-9, 15-18, 20 and 21 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 6, 7, 15, 16, 20, and 21 are independent.

Initially, Applicant notes, to clarify the record, that the statement in paragraph 1 of the Office Action is incorrect. No RCE was filed or established in this application. rather, a CPA was filed in this application on January 21, 2003 (prior to the abolition of CPA practice on July 145, 2003).

Claims 2, 5-9, 11, 14-18, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2002/0012521 A1 (Nagasaka et al.), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2002/0106187 A1 (Inoue).

The general background of the present invention has been discussed adequately in Applicants's previous papers, and it is not deemed necessary to repeat that discussion in full. In the aspects of the invention set forth in the respective present independent claims, one important feature is to extract specific scenes that correspond to a scene that is the object of a search, from among a plurality of moving-picture materials by designating the number of scenes (Claim 6), or the length of a scene as measured in time (Claim 7), and to edit and combine the extracted scenes into a single moving picture.

By virtue of this feature, the number or time length of scenes to be extracted can be designated, so that it is not necessary to repeat the designation of the extraction

criterion (the number or time length of scenes to be extracted), and a single moving picture comprising a plurality of scenes corresponding to the designated number or time length of scenes, each of which is extracted from a plurality of moving-picture material, can be generated. Specifically, when one week of TV programs (for example) is recorded, those serial dramas which have been televised every day for thirty minutes, can be extracted from the TV programs simply by designing the time length (thirty minutes), and they can be combined and output as a single moving picture. Thus, a user can watch successively every scene (each thirty minute scenes) of the serial drama by reproducing the single moving picture. (It will be understood from this, that the use of the word "scene" does not mean that each extracted portion is necessarily what a dramatist or director would consider only a single scene.)

Applicant agrees with the statement in the Office Action that *Nagasaka '521* does not teach or suggest the recited designating means of Claim 6, nor that of Claim 7. The outstanding rejection, therefore, is not correct unless the recited designating means are taught by *Inoue*, and in addition there can be found adequate motivation to combine the teachings of the two documents in such manner as to achieve the structures recited in Claims 6 and 7, respectively.

Inoue relates to a system in which it is possible to designate a desired area, that is, start and end points, of scene, accept or reject each scene (input "OK" or "NG" for each), and a take the number of a scene. This designation is applied to one body of video data, rather than a plurality of bodies of such data. Thus, the designation technique used in

Inoue cannot be used to extract desired scenes from each of a plurality of bodies of video data, as can be done using the apparatus of Claim 6 or that of Claim 7.

Even if the designating function of *Inoue* were combined with *Nagasaka '521*, the result would not meet the terms of either Claim 6 or Claim 7, and those claims are therefore clearly allowable over the proposed combination of those two documents (even assuming for argument's sake that the proposed combination would be a proper one).

Independent Claims 15 and 16 are method claims corresponding respectively to Claims 6 and 7, and Claims 20 and 21 are computer-readable memory claims also corresponding respectively to Claims 6 and 7; Claims 15, 16, 20 and 21 are therefore also believed to be allowable, for substantially the same reasons as are Claims 6 and 7.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 29,286

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN357067v1